

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 3, 2006 considered claims 1-36 and 41-43. Claims 1-36 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carson et al. (US 2004/0093326) hereinafter *Carson*.¹ Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 17, 28 and 41, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

By this amendment claims 1, 17, 28 and 41 have been amended and no claims have been cancelled.² Claims 1, 17, 28 and 41 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to providing taxonomy information regarding one or more desired nodes. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a request for taxonomy-related information, the request including identification data identifying a node within the taxonomy and relationship data identifying a specified relationship a node is to have with the identified node. Claim 1 further defines extracting the identification data and the relationship data from the request. Claim 1 defines querying one or more databases in accordance with the identification data and the relationship data to obtain taxonomy-related information for any nodes having the specified relationship with the identified node, the nodes of each database comprising or being logically ordered under at least one of a plurality of root nodes. Lastly, claim 1 defines receiving taxonomy-related information having at least one identifier that corresponds to a node having the specified relationship with the identified node in response to the query.

Claims 17 defines constructing a request for taxonomy data regarding one or more specified nodes, the specified nodes comprising or being logically ordered under at least one of a plurality of root nodes, the request including identification data from which a node within a the taxonomy may be identified and at least one relationship qualifier that identifies a desired relationship the node is to have with the specified nodes. Claim 17 further defines communicating the request to a server. Claim 17 defines receiving a response from the server regarding the requested taxonomy data including identification information regarding the node

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0004], [0009], [0011], [0033], [0041], [0058], [0060] and Figure 6.

corresponding to the identification data and relationship information corresponding to the relationship qualifier. Lastly, claim 17 defines presenting information about the taxonomy including the received response to the computer user, the information based on the identification information and based on the relationship information in the response.

Claim 28 defines a client, the client including an application program that presents taxonomy-related data using received taxonomy data regarding one or more specified nodes, the specified nodes comprising or being logically ordered under at least one of a plurality of root nodes, the received taxonomy data including identification information regarding a node corresponding to the identification data and relationship information corresponding to a relationship qualifier. Claim 28 further defines a server that maintains taxonomy data, the server configured to receive taxonomy-related requests from the client seeking identification information regarding an existing node and relationship information that indicates the specified relationship between the identified node and the specified nodes, and in response to each request, to locate the relationship information corresponding to the specified nodes in the taxonomy and to return a response to the client. Claim 41 is a system claim similar to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Carson describes providing a taxonomy for mobile E-services (MES's). *Carson* notes that MES providers often appear and disappear at random intervals and thus, the E-services are always changing (par. [0009]). *Carson* describes a system for a taxonomy to describe MES's using a tree structure for organizing descriptive characteristics of the MES (par. [0010]). *Carson* further describes a method for searching MES's by searching each category of MES's (par. [0011]). The described system can also classify MES's by assigning designators to each category of MES (par. [0012]).

Carson fails, however, to teach or suggest querying one or more databases in accordance with the identification data and the relationship data to obtain taxonomy-related information for any nodes having the specified relationship with the identified node, the nodes of each database comprising or being logically ordered under at least one of a plurality of root nodes, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, *Carson* fails to teach or suggest receiving taxonomy-related information having at least one identifier that corresponds to a node having the specified relationship with the

identified node in response to the query, as described in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 17, 28 and 41 also patentably define over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 4th day of December, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
MICHAEL B. DODD
Registration No. 46,437
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

MBD:crb
CRB0000002815V001